



DAC  
SPW

PATENT APPLICATION  
IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

<b>Applicant:</b> Kovac et al.	<b>Examiner:</b> M. Brown
<b>Serial No.:</b> 09/749,254	<b>Group Art Unit:</b> 3764
<b>Filed:</b> December 27, 2000	<b>Docket No.</b> 687-424
<b>For:</b> PELVIC SURGERY DRAPE	(AMS0007/US)

Mail Stop Petition  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

I CERTIFY THAT ON Dec 14, 2005, THIS PAPER  
IS BEING DEPOSITED WITH THE U.S. POSTAL SERVICE AS FIRST CLASS  
MAIL IN AN ENVELOPE ADDRESSED: MAIL STOP PETITION,  
COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS, P.O. BOX 1450, ALEXANDRIA, VA -  
22313-1450.

Paula J. Breeden  
Paula J. Breeden

**Renewed Petition Under 37 C.F.R. 1.137(b)**

Dear Sir:

This Renewed Petition is being filed in response to the dismissal ("Dismissal"), dated November 16, 2005, which Dismissal dismissed Applicant's Petition for Revival of an Application for Patent Abandoned Unintentionally ("Petition"), in the above-identified patent application.

The Petition was filed February 1, 2005, and the Dismissal is date-stamped November 16, 2005. The Dismissal describes that the above-identified patent application became abandoned on August 18, 2004. Applicants filed a Petition dated February 1, 2005, which included claim amendments intended to place all pending claims of the application in condition for allowance. According to the Dismissal, however, the amendment of February 1, 2005, was not sufficient to place all claims in condition for allowance.

Reconsideration of the Dismissal of Applicant's Petition is respectfully requested in view of the attached remarks and claim amendments.

Along with the Dismissal issued an Advisory Action indicating that the amendment filed with Applicant's Response dated February 1, 2005, was not entered, and that claims 1-7, 9-15, 40-41, and 43-44, remain finally rejected.

O.K. to  
Enter  
upon revival

According to a telephone conversation on November 30, 2005, between Applicant's undersigned representative, Dan Schulte, and Petitions Examiner Irvin Dingle, I understand the following:

The Dismissal resulted from the claims of the application as presented in Applicant's Response and amendment dated February 1, 2005, being not all in condition for allowance.

Applicants have a two-month extendable period of reply to the Dismissal, from the date of the Dismissal (November 16, 2005). See the Dismissal, paragraph 3, setting a two-month period for a request for reconsideration. Within this period Applicants may submit amended claims for reconsideration with regard to the Petition.

No fee is required for this Renewed Petition and request for reconsideration. The fee of \$1,500 paid by Applicants with the Petition dated February 1, 2005, is sufficient to cover the present request for reconsideration.

According to a conversation between Applicant's undersigned representative, Dan Schulte, and Examiner Michael Brown, I understand that claim 8 (if re-written in independent form) and claims 27 through 39 and claim 42 are allowed. The attached amendment cancels all subject matter that is not allowed or allowable, and puts the claims in condition for allowance.

Relating to the status of the claims as allowed or not, a final Office action issued May 17, 2004, in which claims 16-39 and 42 were indicated to be allowable. Claim 8 was objected to as being dependent on a rejected claim, but was indicated to be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Claims 1-7, 9-15, 40-41, and 43-44 were rejected. Applicants understand that claims 16 through 27 are no longer considered to be allowable, even though these claims were indicated to be allowable in the final Office action.

No fee is believed to be due at this time. If, however, any additional fee is due, please charge Kagan Binder Deposit Account No. 50-1775 and notify us of the same.